AUGMENTED REALITY PEER FEEDBACK FORM

Feedback completed by: Kathy Snow Lesson Plan Author: Murray Garland

*Please fill out the rubric for the lesson plan which you have reviewed. Also complete the second page, providing written feedback about the strengths, suggestions for improvement, and further questions.*

Criteria Checklist

\_\_\_\_Identifies Instructional Design theory(ies) used.

\_\_X\_\_Augmented Reality incorporated effectively into lesson

\_\_\_\_ Rationale for selected AR application

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content- AR Application**  **20 Points Possible** | Contains many blatant errors and/or shows an obvious lack of effort | Contains several significant errors that make this ineffective as a teaching tool | Contains most of required information, but a few minor issues prevent this from being an effective teaching tool. | Contains all of required information and works well as a teaching tool to cover the basics of this topic. | Shows a high level of application and a deep understanding of augmented reality. Makes the project an excellent teaching tool. |
| **Accuracy** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Thoroughness** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Vocabulary** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Praxis  (from theory to practice)** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Audience and Purpose**  **15 Points Possible** | Little or no attempt given to adjust this for the specific audience. | Some attempt is given to making this accessible, but several issues prohibit the site from being a good teaching tool. | Most of this is considerate of the audience, but certain elements could be more effective as a teaching tool. | Considerate of audience and would help them become engaged with the target content. | Presented in a highly engaging manner. Students would love this and it would help them gain a deep understanding of both AR &targetcontent. |
| **Language** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Rationale** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Educational Value** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **InstructionalDesign**  **15 Points Possible** | Shows little or no effort in to apply instructional design. | Some application apparent, but shows minimal effort in design as it relates to relevant theory. | Shows some application, but some parts could be stronger. | Effective organization and application of instructional design. | Effective, original presentation of all content. |
| **Organization** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **User Friendly** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Content reinforcement** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |

Rubric based on Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy &International Center for Leadership in Education’s Rigor/Relevance Framework: <http://www.leadered.com/rrr.html>

Written Feedback/Comments – please constrain your comments to a maximum of 500 words in total. Bullet points are also acceptable:

1. Please comment on the strengths of the lesson in terms of the adaptation of AR technology
   1. This was designed as an introductory lesson to QCR codes and science, as such the AR technology was not adapted to a lesson but became the lesson itself. The techniques used seemed very manageable for students and a good foundation for working with codes as students would a have to work through the challenges of reading the codes and finding codes.
2. integration of one instructional design theory and
   1. the instructional design theory was not clearly stated. This was presumably designed from a situated cognition perspective. Students were placed in a theoretical “High stakes” without risk situation (The scavenger hunt, and I know how high stakes it is when you are trying to get that last 4 leaf clover in the field...)that would create both practical learning, how to use the technology and motivation.
3. how meet instructional goals for the audience indicated
   1. the objectives of the lesson were to become familiar with the use of QCR codes, this was done in a scavenger hunt format that would likely be very enjoyable for students in this target audience
4. What suggestions would you offer to strengthen the lesson plan(in terms of the adaptation of AR technology, integration of one instructional design theory and how meet instructional goals for the audience indicated)?
   1. Maybe the addition of more science content knowledge, for example making the different kingdoms of items more clear and guiding them to their search this way (but I have no idea what the science curricula expectations are for year 5 in your area!)
5. Please address any further questions or wonderings do you have about this lesson. (Optional)
   1. No wonderings, nice lesson. Looks fun.